

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/202,791

Applicant(s)

Matsushima et al.

Examiner

War

Group Art Unit

1651



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) B. Grant, Esq.

(3) _____

(2) D. Ware, P.E.

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 19, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-29 and 31-44

Identification of prior art discussed:

Did not discuss art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Informed Applicants' Representative that the Supplemental After Final filed October 15, 2001, has been received and will be entered. Upon determination of patentability another interview may be necessary but such decision is being held in abeyance at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/202,791

Applicant(s)
Matsushima et al.

Examiner
Ware

Group Art Unit
1651



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) B. Grant, Esq.

(3) _____

(2) D. Ware, P.E.

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 19, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-29 and 31-44

Identification of prior art discussed:

Did not discuss art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Informed Applicants' Representative that the Supplemental After Final filed October 15, 2001, has been received and will be entered. Upon determination of patentability another interview may be necessary but such decision is being held in abeyance at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.